

1 REMARKS

2 Claims 1, 3-9, 11-18, 20-35, 37 and 39 are pending. No claims are
3 amended. No claims have been added or cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-9,
4 11-18, 20-35, 37, and 39 remain pending. The applicant is hopeful that this matter
5 can be resolved, or at least a framework for resolving it can be laid, before an
6 appeal or a continuation is filed. Accordingly, in light of the following remarks,
7 the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending
8 claims.

9 Alternatively, it is requested that the office reconsider the pending claims
10 on their merit and withdraw the "finality" of the October 10, 2001 rejection.

11
12 25 USC §103

13 Claims 1, 3, 6, 9, 13, 14, 16-18, 21-28, 31, 33-34, and 39 stand rejected
14 under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,018,711 to
15 French St. George et al. (hereafter referred to as "St. George") in view of U.S.
16 Patent No. 5,774,841 to Salazar et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Salazar").
17 Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

18 As a preliminary matter, a previous response filed on July 18, 2001
19 discussed St. George in view of Salazar at length, and demonstrated the
20 allowability of the pending claims over the cited references. Those arguments are
21 not repeated herein, but are incorporated by reference. The office is urged to
22 reconsider those arguments in light of the understanding gained from the
23 following comments.

1 Claim 1 recites “a speech recognition engine to recognize an utterance” and
2 “the speech recognition engine being configured to actively listen for the utterance
3 for a predetermined response time”.

4 In addressing this recited feature, the action on page 2 points to St.
5 George’s teaching in col. 6, lines 9-67 through col. 9, lines 1-9, to assert that St.
6 George teaches the recited feature of claim 1. Applicant disagrees.

7 St. George teaches user interface for receiving speech input (i.e., signals, or
8 samples) within an extendable window of time. These speech signals are not
9 interpreted or recognized until *after* the window of time for receiving signals has
10 closed. Specifically, St. George at col. 8, lines 24-30, explicitly states that only
11 when the “recognition window is closed at T=Tw the aggregated speech sample is
12 sent for speech recognition”. Thus, even though St. George’s uses the words
13 “recognition window”, St. George at most teaches that audio signals are accepted
14 during this window of time and not sent for actual speech recognition until after
15 the time for receiving speech input has expired.

16 The applicant’s specification clearly describes the meaning of “actively
17 listen”, as recited in claim 1. Specifically, the specification points out that “user
18 interface 30 improves user interaction with the speech recognition system 20 by
19 conveying to the user that the system is actively listening for a recognizable
20 utterance or has heard and understood a recognizable utterance.” An utterance
21 cannot be recognizable or heard and understood until it has been interpreted.
22 Because St. George teaches that speech samples are not interpreted until after a
23 window of time for receiving speech input has expired, St. George does not teach
24 or suggest “a speech recognition engine to recognize an utterance” and “the speech

1 recognition engine being configured to actively listen for the utterance for a
2 predetermined response time", as recited by claim 1.

3 The action relies on Salazar primarily for the teaching of user feedback
4 upon recognition of a spoken command. Thus, Salazar does not overcome the
5 deficiencies of St. George. For this reason alone, the references of record, either
6 singly or in combination do not teach or suggest the features of claim 1.

7 Additionally, claim 1 further recites "the speech recognition engine being
8 configured to enter a dormant state if the utterance is not recognized within the
9 predetermined amount of time".

10 In addressing this feature, the action on page 2 points to St. George's
11 teaching that speech input is interpreted after a window of time for receiving
12 speech signals has expired to conclude that the recited feature is taught by St.
13 George. The applicant disagrees for the reasons already discussed. St. George
14 does not interpret anything while speech input is being gathered. Rather, St.
15 George at most teaches that as speech input is being gathered the time for input
16 decreases (unless a user selects a reset button) and a balloon animation is changed.

17 For these reasons alone, the St. George does not teach or suggest the recited
18 feature.

19 Moreover, after St. George's window of time for receiving input has
20 expired (e.g., because a user has failed to press a reset button), the window is
21 closed and any received input is sent "for speech recognition". Thus, St. George
22 sends input speech signals to a speech interpreter after the window for receiving
23 input has closed. A speech engine that in interpreting speech is not dormant or
24 asleep. For these reasons, St. George does not teach or suggest anything like "the
25

1 speech recognition engine" entering any "dormant state if the utterance is not
2 recognized within the predetermined amount of time", as applicant claims.

3 Salazar's visual feedback upon recognizing a command does not teach or
4 suggest "the speech recognition engine being configured to enter a dormant state if
5 the utterance is not recognized within the predetermined amount of time", as claim
6 recites.

7 For these additional reasons, the references of record, either singly or in
8 combination do not teach or suggest the features of claim 1.

9 Additionally, claim 1 further recites "the speech recognition system
10 remaining in the dormant state until recognition of a starter word that is
11 independent of the utterance".

12 The action on page 5 admits that St. George in view of Salazar does not
13 teach or suggest "...sleep mode...awakened to an active mode upon detection of a
14 starter utterance". The words used in the action's concession are not exactly what
15 are recited in the above feature of claim 1. Yet, the action does not point out how
16 the references, which concededly do not teach or suggest "...sleep
17 mode...awakened to an active mode upon detection of a starter utterance", teach
18 or suggest "the speech recognition system remaining in the dormant state until
19 recognition of a starter word that is independent of the utterance", as applicant
20 claims. The applicant respectfully submits that nowhere do the references of
21 record teach or suggest this feature.

22 For this additional reason, the references of record, either singly or in
23 combination do not teach or suggest the features of claim 1. If these features of
24 claim 1 are again rejected on the same basis, the applicant respectfully requests the
25 office to point out where the references of record teach or suggest this feature.

1 Moreover, claim 1 further recites “a user interface to [...] display a
2 countdown graphic that changes with lapsing of the predetermined response time”
3 and “restart the countdown graphic in the event the speech recognition engine
4 recognizes the utterance.”

5 The action on page 3 concedes that neither St. George nor Salazar teach or
6 suggest this recited feature. Even in view of this lack of teaching, however, the
7 action concludes that it would have been obvious to further modify the primary
8 and secondary references because such a modification would “continually grant
9 the user maximum response time for generating an utterance to be recognized”.

10 Applicant disagrees.

11 For the reasons already discussed, St. George explicitly teaches that no
12 speech is interpreted until after the window of time for receiving verbal signals has
13 expired. Thus, St. George’s system may not interpret any voice signal until after
14 the window for receiving input has closed. Additionally, St. George teaches that a
15 user resets the window of time for receiving speech input by providing tactile
16 input such as a user button or key press. Nowhere does St. George teach or
17 suggest “restart the countdown graphic in the event the speech recognition engine
18 recognizes the utterance”, as applicant claims.

19 Salazar’s teaching of visual or audio feedback in response to the receipt of
20 voice input does not cure this deficiency of St. George. Thus, to provide this
21 missing feature of claim 1, the action seemingly relies on personal knowledge of
22 the office without pointing to any specific reference.

23 “When a rejection in an application is based on facts within the personal
24 knowledge of an employee of the office, the data shall be as specific as possible,
25 and the reference must be supported, when called for by the applicant, by the

1 affidavit of such employee, and such affidavit shall be subject to contradiction or
2 explanation by the affidavits of the applicant and other persons.” 37 CFR
3 §1.104(d)(2). If this rejection is maintained on a similar basis in a subsequent
4 action, the applicant respectfully requests the examiner to supply such an affidavit
5 to support this modification to the primary reference in view of the secondary
6 reference.

7 For each of the above reasons, the references of record, either singly or in
8 combination do not teach or suggest the features of claim 1.

9 Accordingly, the 35 USC §103 rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

10 **Claims 3 and 6** depend from claim 1 and are patentably distinguished over
11 the references of record by virtue of this dependency.

12 Accordingly, the 35 USC §103 rejection of claims 3 and 6 should be
13 withdrawn.

14 **Claim 9** recites:

15 “[...] a grammar that holds a subset of the utterances in the
16 vocabulary;

17 a speech recognition engine to recognize the utterances in the
grammar within a predetermined response time, the speech
recognition engine being configured to enter a dormant state if the
utterances are not recognized within the predetermined response of
time; and

18 a user interface to display a countdown graphic that changes
with lapsing of the response time, wherein the user interface restarts
the countdown graphic in the event the speech recognition engine
recognizes the one of the utterances.”

19 For the reasons discussed above in reference to claim 1, the references of
20 record, either singly or in combination, do not teach or suggest the various features
21 of claim 9.

22 Accordingly, the 35 USC §103 rejection of claim 9 should be withdrawn.

1 **Claims 13, 14, 16, and 17** depend from claim 9 and are patentably
2 distinguished over the references of record by virtue of this dependency.

3 Accordingly, the 35 USC §103 rejection of claims 13, 14, 16, and 17
4 should be withdrawn.

5 **Claim 18** recites:

6 *[...] a graphic progress bar shown on the display that
7 indicates a response time in which the speech recognition system is
8 awaiting a user to speak, the progress bar shortening with passage
9 of the response time, wherein the graphic progress bar is lengthened
10 to its initial position after each recognized user input, wherein the
11 user interface plays an audible sound when the speech recognition
engine recognizes one of the utterances within the predetermined
response time, and wherein the user interface indicates that the
speech recognition engine is in a dormant state when at least one of
the utterances is not recognized within the predetermined response
of time."*

12 For the reasons already discussed, the references of record, either singly or
13 in combination, do not teach or suggest these features of claim 18.

14 Accordingly, the 35 USC §103 rejection of claim 18 should be withdrawn.

15 **Claims 21 and 22** depend from claim 18 and are patentably distinguished
16 over the references of record by virtue of this dependency.

17 Accordingly, the 35 USC §103 rejection of claims 21 and 22 should be
18 withdrawn.

19 **Claim 23** recites:

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 “[...] a graphic shown on the display that indicates a fixed
2 response time in which the speech recognition system is awaiting
3 receipt of an utterance via the audio input, the graphic diminishing
4 in size with the passage of time, the graphic returning to an original
5 size after each recognized utterance; and

6 an audio generator to emit a first audible sound when the
7 speech recognition system recognizes the utterance, the audio
8 generator being further configured to emit a second audible sound
9 when the fixed response time has expired before the utterance has
10 been recognized, the second sound indicating that the speech
11 recognition system has entered a dormant state.”

12 For the reasons already discussed, the references of record, either singly or
13 in combination, do not teach or suggest these features of claim 23.

14 Accordingly, the 35 USC §103 rejection of claim 23 should be withdrawn.

15 **Claims 24-26** depend from claim 23 and are patentably distinguished over
16 the references of record by virtue of this dependency.

17 Accordingly, the 35 USC §103 rejection of claims 24-26 should be
18 withdrawn.

19 **Claim 27** recites:

20 “A vehicle computer system comprising:

21 a computer;

22 an open platform operating system executing on the
23 computer, the operating system being configured to support
24 multiple applications; and

25 a speech recognition system to detect utterances used to
control at least one of the applications running on the computer, the
speech recognition system having a user interface to provide visual
and auditory feedback indicating whether an utterance is
recognized, the user interface being configured to play a first
audible sound indicating recognition of the utterance and to display
a graphic that diminishes in size from an original size with the
passage of time, the graphic returning to the original size after each
recognized utterance, the user interface being further configured to
emit a second audible sound when a predetermined response time
has expired before the utterance has been recognized, the second
sound indicating that the speech recognition system has entered a
dormant state.”

1 For the reasons already discussed, the references of record, either singly or
2 in combination, do not teach or suggest these features. Accordingly, for these
3 reasons alone, the 35 USC §103 rejection of claim 27 should be withdrawn.

4 Moreover, claim 27 recites "the computer", which is "[a] vehicle computer
5 system". The references of record are completely silent with respect to this
6 feature. If this claim is again rejected with respect to these references, the
7 applicant respectfully requests for the action to point out where this feature is
8 taught or suggested.

9 Accordingly, for this additional reason, the 35 USC §103 rejection of
10 claim 27 should be withdrawn.

11 **Claims 28 and 31** depend from claim 27 and are patentably distinguished
12 over the references of record by virtue of this dependency.

13 Accordingly, the 35 USC §103 rejection of claims 28 and 31 should be
14 withdrawn.

15 **Claim 33** recites:

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 “*A collaboration system involving multiple interconnected
2 devices comprising:*

3 *a voice input mechanism resident at each of the devices;
4 an audio output system resident at each of the devices; and*

5 *a user interface to provide visual and auditory feedback
6 indicating when a party located at one of the devices can speak, the
7 user interface being configured to play an audible sound when the
8 party can begin speaking and to display a graphic that changes with
9 lapsing of time to indicate a duration that the party can speak, the
10 graphic diminishing in size from an original size with the passage of
time, the graphic returning to the original size after each recognized
utterance, wherein the user interface plays an audible sound upon
recognizing an utterance within the duration that the party can
speak, the user interface emitting a second audible sound when the
duration has expired before the utterance has been recognized, the
second sound indicating that the speech recognition system has
entered a dormant state.”*

11 For the reasons already discussed, the references of record, either singly or
12 in combination, do not teach or suggest these features. Accordingly, for these
13 reasons alone, the 35 USC §103 rejection of claim 33 should be withdrawn.

14 Moreover, claim 27 recites “the devices”, which are part of “[a]
15 collaboration system”. The references of record are completely silent with respect
16 to this feature. If this claim is again rejected with respect to these references, the
17 applicant respectfully requests for the action to point out where this feature is
18 taught or suggested.

19 Accordingly, for this additional reason, the 35 USC §103 rejection of
20 claim 33 should be withdrawn.

21 **Claim 34 recites:**

22 “*changing the graphic to indicate passage of the response time such that the
23 graphic diminishes in size from an original size with the passage of time*”, and

24

25

1 "responsive to recognizing an utterance, presenting the graphic in the original
2 size".

3 For the reasons discussed above in reference to claim 1, the references of
4 record, either singly or in combination, do not teach or suggest this feature of
5 claim 34.

6 Additionally, claim 34 recites "responsive to expiration of the response
7 time before the audible utterance has been recognized, emitting a second sound to
8 indicate that the speech recognition system has entered a dormant state." For the
9 reasons discussed above in reference to claim 1, the references of record, either
10 singly or in combination, do not teach or suggest this feature of claim 34.

11 Moreover, nowhere do the references of record teach "playing a first sound
12 when an audible utterance is recognized" and "emitting a second sound to indicate
13 that the speech recognition system has entered a dormant state." If this feature is
14 again rejected, the applicant respectfully requests for the office to point out where
15 this feature is taught or suggested in the references.

16 Accordingly, for each of these reasons, the 35 USC §103 rejection of
17 claim 34 should be withdrawn.

18 Claim 39 depends from claim 34 and is allowable over the references of
19 record by virtue of this dependency. Accordingly, the 35 USC §103 rejection of
20 claim 39 should be withdrawn.

21
22 Claims 4-5, 7-8, 11-12, 15, 20, 29-30, 32, 35, and 37 stand rejected under
23 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over St. George in view of Salazar as
24 applied to claims 1, 9, 18, 23, 27, and 34, and further in view of U.S. Patent No.

1 6,075,534 to VanBuskirk et al. (hereinafter referred to as "VanBuskirk").

2 Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

3 **Claims 4, 11, 20, 29, and 37** depend from one of claims 1, 9, 18, 27, or 34.

4 For the respective reasons discussed above, in reference to claims 1, 9, 18, 27, and
5 34, dependent claims 4, 11, 20, 29, and 37—by virtue of their respective
6 dependency on an allowable base claim, are allowable over St. George in view of
7 Salazar.

8 In addressing these claims, the action on page 4 concedes that neither St.
9 George nor Salazar teach or suggest "...interface displays visual elements in a first
10 color..." Instead, the action relies on VanBuskirk's teaching of a status bar that
11 changes color to represent volume level of dictated speech to conclude it would
12 have been obvious to modify St. George in view of Salazar to incorporate the
13 status bar of VanBuskirk to provide a user with an additional option to monitor
14 input response time. Even if this were true, however, VanBuskirk's status bar
15 does not cure the above-discussed deficiencies of St. George in view of Salazar.

16 For these reasons, the cited combination does not teach or suggest the
17 features of claims 4, 11, 20, 29, and 37.

18 Accordingly, the 35 USC §103 rejection of claims 4, 11, 20, 29, and 37
19 should be withdrawn.

20 **Claims 5, 12, 30, and 35** depend from one of claims 1, 9, 18, 27, or 34.

21 For the respective reasons discussed above, in reference to claims 1, 9, 18, 27, and
22 34, dependent claims 5, 12, 30, and 35—by virtue of their respective dependency
23 on an allowable base claim, are allowable over St. George in view of Salazar.

24 Additionally, in addressing these claims, the action on page 5 admits that
25 neither St. George nor Salazar teach or suggest "countdown bar comprises a

1 progress bar". Instead, the Office relies on VanBuskirk's status bar that
2 graphically represents change in volume level of dictated speech to conclude it
3 would have been obvious to modify St. George in view of Salazar to incorporate
4 the status bar of VanBuskirk to provide a user with an additional option to monitor
5 input response time. Even if this were true, however, for the reasons already
6 discussed VanBuskirk's status bar does not cure the above-discussed deficiencies
7 of St. George in view of Salazar. Therefore, the cited combination does not teach
8 or suggest the features of claims 5, 12, 30, and 35.

9 Accordingly, the 35 USC §103 rejection of claims 5, 12, 30, and 35 should
10 be withdrawn.

11 **Claims 7, 15, and 32** depend from one of claims 1, 9, or 27. For the
12 respective reasons discussed above, in reference to claims 1, 9, and 27, dependent
13 claims 7, 15, and 32—by virtue of their respective dependency on an allowable
14 base claim, are allowable over St. George in view of Salazar.

15 In addressing these claims, the action concedes that neither St. George nor
16 Salazar teach or suggest "a sleep mode and is awakened to an active mode upon
17 detection of a starter utterance", as respectively recited by these claims. Instead,
18 the action relies on VanBuskirk's status bar (indicating that a system is not active
19 and can be awakened with a proper voice command or by manual means) to
20 conclude that the features of these claims are obvious in view of the cited
21 combination. However, VanBuskirk's status bar does not cure the above-
22 discussed deficiencies of St. George in view of Salazar. Therefore, the cited
23 combination does not teach or suggest the features of claims 7, 15, and 32.

24 Accordingly, the 35 USC §103 rejection of claims 7, 15, and 32 should be
25 withdrawn.

1 Claim 8 depends from claim 1 and for the reasons discussed above is
2 allowable over St. George in view of Salazar by virtue of this dependency.

3 In addressing this claim, the action admits that St. George in view of
4 Salazar does not teach or suggest the features of claim 8. Instead, the Office relies
5 on VanBuskirk' teaching of status information to indicate that a system is in a
6 sleep mode that can be activated responsive to a command (or manual means) to
7 conclude that the features of claim 8 are obvious. Applicant disagrees.

8 VanBuskirk's status information and sleep mode that may be activated by a
9 command (or manual means) does not cure the above-discussed deficiencies of St.
10 George in view of Salazar. Therefore, the cited combination does not teach or
11 suggest the features of claim 8.

12 Accordingly, the 35 USC §103 rejection of claim 8 should be withdrawn.

13 Conclusion

14 Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are in condition for
15 allowance and action to that end is requested. Short of allowance, a withdrawal of
16 finality is urgently requested. If any questions remain that prevent issuance of this
17 application, the office is invited to contact the undersigned attorney.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2 Respectfully Submitted,
3
4 Dated: 11/20/2001 By: Brian G. Hart
5 Brian G. Hart
6 Reg. No. 44,421
7 (509) 324-9256
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25